

1 LAURA E. DUFFY  
United States Attorney  
2 HAROLD W. CHUN  
Assistant United States Attorneys  
3 California Bar No. 239022  
United States Attorney's Office  
4 Federal Office Building  
880 Front Street, Room 6293  
5 San Diego, California 92101-8893  
Tel: (619) 546-6751  
6 Email: harold.chun@usdoj.gov

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
United States of America

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Case No. 12CR4868-DMS

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

**RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO  
DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO:  
(1) SUPPRESS EVIDENCE**

13 CRAIG LASALLE WRIGHT,

14 Defendant.

15  
16 COMES NOW, the plaintiff, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, by and  
17 through its counsel LAURA E. DUFFY, United States Attorney, and  
18 Harold W. Chun, Assistant U.S. Attorney, and hereby files its Response in  
19 Opposition to Defendants Motions, which is based upon the files and records of this  
20 case.

21 **I**

22 **STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

23 On April 1, 2014, Wright filed a supplemental motion regarding his motion to  
24 suppress. Below is the government's response in opposition to the supplemental  
25 motion. The government incorporates the facts of the case from its initial response in  
26 opposition filed on March 4, 2014.

27  
28

## POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Defendant no longer challenges the legality of the collective knowledge doctrine, but instead, contends that law enforcement had insufficient probable cause to stop the vehicle in which Wright was traveling in. Defendant's argument is flawed from the outset, as he contends that "[t]he government bases probable cause solely on the words of its informant." [Def. Mot. at 2.] Defendant then quotes a short conversation between FBI Special Agent Cheviron and the informant, suggesting this was the totality of evidence to stop the vehicle. [Id.] This, of course, is wrong. The traffic stop of Wright was not based solely on the brief quoted conversation, but on all of the evidence collected over the prior months leading up to the event. The evidence included numerous recorded meetings with Wright and McKennie discussing details of a cocaine sale, such as price, weight, frequency and dates. Furthermore, the stop is supported by the facts surrounding the events of that day, particularly with McKennie flying in from Chicago that day to purchase cocaine from the informant. Additionally, the informant himself can be deemed credible about the event, as the informant is aware s/he has nothing to gain by providing inaccurate information about Wright and McKennie, particularly since s/he is aware the information provided will lead to a traffic stop. Moreover, the informant was aware that the meeting was recorded, and so his/her actions could be examined after the fact.<sup>1</sup> Based on the totality of the circumstances, there was an abundance of

- 2 -

1 evidence to establish probable cause to stop Wright's vehicle. Defendant's motion  
2 should be denied.

3 DATED: April 7, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

4 LAURA E. DUFFY  
5 United States Attorney

6 /s/Harold W. Chun  
7 HAROLD W. CHUN  
8 Assistant U.S. Attorney

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Case No. 12-CR-4868-DMS

4 Plaintiff,

5 v.

**Certificate of Service**

6 CRAIG WRIGHT,

7 Defendant.  
8  
9

10 IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED THAT:  
11

12 I, Harold W. Chun, am a citizen of the United States and am at least eighteen  
13 years of age. My business address is 880 Front Street, Room 6293, San Diego,  
California 92101-8893.

14 I am not a party to the above-entitled action. I have caused service of  
15 Government's Response in Opposition to Motions on the following parties by  
courier service:

16 John Ellis, Federal Defenders of San Diego

17 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on  
April 7, 2014.

18 s/ Harold W. Chun  
19 HAROLD W. CHUN  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28